

REMARKS

This Reply is filed in response to the October 7, 2008 Office Action.¹ Claims 1-20 were presented for examination and were rejected. Claims 1, 7, 13, 18 and 20 are in independent form. No claims are amended, added or canceled. Thus, claims 1-20 are pending.

Claims 13-20 rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 13-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Office Action, pg 3, with respect to claims 13, 18 and 20 alleges that “there is not sufficient description to support the claimed subject matter of one potential visitor sending the registration request for *all* of the potential visitors.” (emphasis in original) Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection because such support is clearly provided in the application as filed.

Applicants had previously provided information regarding support in its prior response filed June 20, 2008, pg 23, as follows: “Support for these amendments and new claim 20 can be found in the application as filed. For example, for the claim amendments see at least paragraphs [0030], [0033], [0052], [0062], [0071], and [0073] and item S1035 in Fig. 10. For new claim 20, see the foregoing references as well as Fig. 1 and discussion thereof in the specification.” The Examiner is again referred to all of this supporting material, for example, paragraph [0030]

¹ The Office Action may contain a number of statements characterizing the cited references and/or the claims which Applicants may not expressly identify herein. Regardless of whether or not any such statement is identified herein, Applicants do not automatically subscribe to, or acquiesce in, any such statement.

wherein it states: "Upon selection of a particular time slot, the visitor supplies registration information for all visitors that will be accompanying the registered visitor." (emphasis added) For another example, paragraph [0062] wherein it states: "In step S1035 [referring to Fig. 10] the visitor(s) supply registration information for all visitors." (emphasis added) Thus, clear support is provided and Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, rejection of claims 13-20 be withdrawn.

Claims 1-20 rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-5 and 7-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being un-patentable over Luc Chee Lip et al. (U.S. 2002/0099794 A1; hereinafter "Lip") in view of Farenden (U.S. 2002/0128894 A1; hereinafter "Farenden"). Claims 6 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being un-patentable over Lip in view of Farenden as applied to claims 1-5 and 7-11, further in view of Williams (U.S. 2004/0243435; hereinafter "Williams"). Claims 13-17 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being un-patentable over Lip in view of Farenden and Williams. Lastly, claims 18 -20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being un-patentable over Farenden in view of Lip and Williams. These rejections are traversed because these references, taken individually or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest the subject matter recited in Applicants' claims for at least the following reasons.

Consider, for example, claim 1 which is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being un-patentable over Lip in view of Farenden. Claim 1 recites:

An inmate visitation system, comprising:

means for receiving a visitation request from an inmate for a plurality of potential visitors to attend the same visitation,

means for sending from one of the plurality of potential visitors a registration request for each of the plurality of potential visitors based upon the received visitation request;

means for receiving registration information based upon the sent registration request;

means for determining whether the visitation request from the inmate is approved or disapproved; and

means for communicating the approval or disapproval of the visitation request.

(Claim 1, emphasis added) The Office Action (pg 5) admits that Lip does not teach “means for sending from one of the plurality of potential visitors a registration request for each of the plurality of potential visitors based upon the received visitation request.”

The Office Action (pg 6) relies on Farenden, paragraphs 118, 119 and 161 to teach “means for sending from one of the plurality of potential visitors a registration request for each of the plurality of potential visitors based upon the received visitation request.” However, there is nothing in any of these paragraphs that teach or suggest this claim limitation. Paragraph 118 discusses candidate identification, presenting four categories of candidate: web candidates, current interns, pre-selected candidates and referred candidates. Paragraph 119 discusses completion of an employment skill questionnaire and a personal profile by the candidates, or searching posted employment opportunities. Paragraph 161 discusses employer-hosted recruiting events over multiple days on the employer’s facility, where the candidates are evaluated through interviews, etc. and where hiring decisions are made during the event. Nothing in these paragraphs, and nothing in all of Farenden, teaches that one of the job candidates or interns sends a registration request or invitation to the other job candidates or interns.

Instead, Farenden teaches that a potential employer invites job candidates for interviews, but the employer, or the recruiter working for the employer, is obviously not one of the job candidates and, therefore, cannot be read on “one of the plurality of potential visitors” as recited in claim 1. Clearly, the employer, or the recruiter working for the employer, is not a visitor at their own facility.

Indeed, in paragraph 161, it discusses an employer-hosted recruiting event “on site” which means that potential job candidates are invited by an employer to its facility. Under those conditions, the employer and its agents such as the recruiter are “on site” and the job candidates are a plurality of potential visitors. Clearly, it is the potential employer who is inviting all job candidates to its facility, and none of the job candidates themselves are described in Farenden as registering other job candidates. This is not surprising because, in a job-fair, one candidate would not normally know the identity and contact information of all the other job candidates. However, even if that were known, the one candidate would probably not want to assist other candidates by registering them, because that could increase the competition for a desired job slot. Therefore, not only does Farrenden not disclose or suggest: “means for sending from one of the plurality of potential visitors a registration request for each of the plurality of potential visitors based upon the received visitation request” as recited in claim 1, but Farrenden actually teaches away from that claim limitation.

Therefore, since Lip, admittedly, does not teach or suggest this claim limitation and since Farenden, as shown above, does not teach or suggest this claim limitation, then Lip and Farenden, individually, or in any reasonable combination,² do not teach or suggest this limitation

² Applicants do not acquiesce in the combinability of Lip and Farenden in the first place.

of claim 1. Accordingly, the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

Independent claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being un-patentable over Lip in view of Farenden. Claim 7 recites, *inter alia*: “sending from one of the plurality of potential visitors a registration request for each of the plurality of potential visitors based upon the received visitation request” and is allowable for the same reasons given with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claim 7 should be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

Independent claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being un-patentable over Lip in view of Farenden and Williams. Claim 13 recites, *inter alia*: “visitation registration program code for ...automatically approving or disapproving a registration request for each of the plurality of potential visitors, the registration request sent from one of the plurality of potential visitors for each of the plurality of potential visitors based upon the visitation request...” Lip and Farenden do not disclose or suggest this limitation for reasons given above with respect to claim 1. Williams does not cure this deficiency of Lip and Farenden. Accordingly the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claim 13 should be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

Independent claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being un-patentable over Farenden in view of Lip and Williams. Claim 18 recites, *inter alia*: “supplying the requested registration information to a sender of the request, the requested registration information being supplied by the one potential visitor about each one of the plurality of potential visitors.” Farenden and Lip do not disclose or suggest this limitation for reasons given above with respect

to claim 1. Williams does not cure this deficiency of Farenden and Lip. Accordingly the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claim 18 should be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

Independent claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being un-patentable over Farenden in view of Lip and Williams. Claim 20 recites a method comprising, *inter alia*: “the one potential visitor supplying the requested registration information to the least one prison network interface about each one of the plurality of potential visitors.” Farenden and Lip do not disclose or suggest this limitation for reasons given above with respect to claim 1. Williams does not cure this deficiency of Farenden and Lip. Accordingly the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claim 20 should be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

Claims 2-6, dependent from claim 1, are allowable, at least for reasons based on their dependencies from allowable base claim 1.

Claims 8-12, dependent from claim 7, are allowable, at least for reasons based on their dependencies from allowable base claim 7.

Claims 14-17, dependent from claim 13, are allowable, at least for reasons based on their dependencies from allowable base claim 13.

Claim 19, dependent from claim 18, is allowable, at least for reasons based on its dependencies from allowable base claim 18.

CONCLUSION

Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested in view of the foregoing remarks.³

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 07-2347 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
Verizon Corporate Services Group Inc.

By: 
Joe Wall
Reg. No. 25,648

Date: December 30, 2008

Verizon
Patent Management Group
1515 Courthouse Road, Suite 500
Arlington, VA 22201 - 2909
Tel: 703.351.3586
Fax: 703.351.3665

Customer No. 25,537

³ As Applicant's remarks with respect to the Examiner's rejections are sufficient to overcome these rejections, Applicant's silence as to assertions by the Examiner in the Office Action or certain requirements that may be applicable to such rejections (e.g., whether a reference constitutes prior art, motivation to combine references, assertions as to dependent claims, etc.) is not a concession by Applicant that such assertions are accurate or such requirements have been met, and Applicant reserves the right to analyze and dispute such assertions/requirements in the future.